



RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

- CALL TO ORDER
- ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

MINUTES:

PRESENT: COUNCILMEN WEEKLY and MACK

Also Present: COUNCILWOMAN BOGGS McDONALD, DEPUTY CITY MANAGER DOUG SELBY, CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED, ACTING DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT ROBERT GENZER, JOHN KOSWAN, CURRENT PLANNING MANAGER, CHRIS GLORE, PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT and DEPUTY CITY CLERK ANGELA CROLLI

ANNOUNCEMENT MADE - Meeting noticed and posted at the following locations:

Downtown Transportation Center, City Clerk's Board

Senior Citizens Center, 450 E. Bonanza Road

Clark County Government Center, 500 S. Grand Central Pkwy

Court Clerk's Bulletin Board, City Hall

City Hall Plaza, Posting Board

(4:02)

1-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-22 – Prohibits the operation of an escort bureau from a residential zone.

Sponsored by: Councilwoman Lynette Boggs McDonald

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will prohibit the operation of an escort bureau from a residential zone. In addition, it will require such a business to be actually conducted from a fixed business location.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-22

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-22 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD explained that this particular ordinance came about when an item appeared on the City Council agenda requesting that an escort service be established in Summerlin. Of course, this was the first application of its type in more than 30 years and her concern was that this would set a precedent, as well as determining the suitability of where these types of businesses should be established. Therefore, she is sponsoring this Bill, as well as Bill 2001-23, in order to set a standard that the City believes that these types of uses should not be allowed in residential areas, only in fixed locations and certain commercial zones.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 1 – Bill 2001-22

MINUTES - Continued:

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED pointed out that the current zoning ordinance allows certain uses, if they meet certain criteria, to be approved as home occupations. This particular use was not clearly defined as either in or out. It could have been approved if the right standards were met. This Bill will indicate that in order to have an escort bureau license, from a zoning perspective, it cannot be allowed as a home occupation and from the license perspective, it needs to have an actual physical location if located in a commercial zone.

DETECTIVE TONI WEEKS, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, indicated that Metro supports the proposed ordinances because they would specify the type of service rendered. Her comments have been made a part of the final minutes in an attached verbatim excerpt.

LEE HAYNES, appeared on behalf of the group Porno Only In Zone (POIZ), who supports the proposed ordinances and appreciates the City trying to prevent these types of businesses in residential neighborhoods. He stated that there are grave problems in the City's business licensing law and with business licensing personnel. Adequate safeguards are already in place in the City's zoning ordinances that prevent such businesses. Title 19A defines that a sexually oriented business is required to operate in certain areas: C-M and M. One of these would apply to this escort service. MR. HAYNES commented that on February 13, 2001, he filed a lawsuit in the Clark County District Court, Department 4. However, he lost the petition for writ mandamus to require the City to enforce the Las Vegas Municipal Code Title 6, Chapter 6.02.080, which requires all business license applications be signed under penalty of perjury. The judge ruled that a citizen, such as himself, has no standing bringing such a lawsuit. That ruling is being appealed, but this ordinance is needed in the interim.

JUANITA CLARK, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, concurred with MR. HAYNES' comments. She pointed out that the business that applied for a business license in the area of Summerlin is on the consent agenda for the March 7, 2001, City Council meeting. She asked that the item be taken off the consent agenda for discussion. This business should not be located in a residential area, only in C-M or C zoning areas. She urged the Recommending Committee to approve both proposed ordinances and requested that a definition be given for the type of business noted on Item 2. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD replied that it would be appropriate that Item 17 on the consent agenda of the March 7, 2001, City Council meeting be trailed for discussion until after these ordinances have been adopted.

JUNE INGRAM, Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, appeared to speak on the item and concurred with both MS. CLARK's and MR. HAYNES' comments.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 1 – Bill 2001-22

MINUTES - Continued:

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD asked CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED whether any particular zones have been delineated anywhere in the ordinance. CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY STEED replied that if this is a business office, it would be allowed wherever business offices are located. If it has on-site entertainment, then it would fall within the definition of a sexual oriented business and would be restricted to C-M or M.

COUNCILMAN MACK commented that many professional buildings are located adjacent to residential properties and, therefore, residents are especially concerned if this type of business is allowed to go in a professional office building. COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD indicated that she would entertain having the ordinance better defined.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: A verbatim excerpt of DETECTIVE TONI WEEKS' comments is made a part of the Final Minutes.

(4:02 – 4:15)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-23 – Prohibits the operation of an outcall entertainment referral service business from a residential zone. Sponsored by: Councilwoman Lynette Boggs McDonald

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will prohibit the operation of an outcall entertainment referral service business from a residential zone. In addition, it will require such a business to be actually conducted from a fixed business location.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-23

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-23 be forwarded to the Full Council with no recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD and CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED directed that all of the comments made pertaining to Bill 2001-22 be incorporated by reference to Item 2, Bill 2001-23.

DEBRA TAYLOR appeared to speak on the item and concurred with all the comments made by COUNCILWOMAN McDONALD during the discussion of Bill 2001-22.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 2 – Bill 2001-23

MINUTES - Continued:

COUNCILMAN MACK expressed concern regarding the residential adjacency to professional businesses where this type of business might be allowed. Therefore, he recommended this item be forwarded to the City Council with no recommendation for further discussion.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:15 – 4:16)

1-410

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-19 – Ordinance Creating Special Improvement District No. 1473 - Ann Road (US-95 Freeway to Allen Lane). Sponsored by: Step Requirement

Fiscal Impact

☐

No Impact

Amount: \$ 421,517.83

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division: PW/SID

☒

Augmentation Required

Funding Source: Capital Projects Fund - Special Assessments

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Installation of pavement, medians and/or center left turn lanes, storm drain facilities, traffic control devices, curb, and gutter, sidewalk, streetlights, residential and commercial driveways, sewer laterals and water laterals. Costs will be recovered over a 10 year period through the levy and collection of special assessments.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-19

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-19 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED stated that the Bill is in order.

No one appeared in opposition.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 3 – Bill 2001-19

MINUTES - Continued:

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:16 – 4:17)

1-456

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-20 – Annexation No. A-0012-99(A) – Property Location: On the northwest corner of Fort Apache Road and Gilmore Avenue; Petitioned By: City of Las Vegas; Acreage: Approximately 5.17 acres; Zoned: R-E and PF (County Zoning), U (ML) and C-V (City Equivalents). Sponsored by: Councilman Larry Brown

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The proposed ordinance annexes certain real property located on the northwest corner of Fort Apache Road and Gilmore Avenue. The annexation is at the request of the City, as lessee, with the concurrence of the Bureau of Land Management as owner. The annexation process has now been completed in accordance with the NRS and the final date of annexation (March 30, 2001) is set by this ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-20 and Location Map

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-20 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED stated that the Bill is in order.

No one appeared in opposition.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 4 – Bill 2001-20

MINUTES - Continued:

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:17)

1-472

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-21 – Annexation No. A-0019-00(A) – Property Location: On the northwest corner of Ann Road and Durango Drive; Petitioned By: Ann/Durango Holding, LLC; Acreage: 5.39 acres; Zoned: R-E (County Zoning), U (DR) (City Equivalent). Sponsored by: Councilman Michael Mack

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The proposed ordinance annexes certain real property located on the northwest corner of Ann Road and Durango Drive. The annexation is at the request of the property owner. The annexation process has now been completed in accordance with the NRS and the final date of annexation (March 30, 2001) is set by this ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-21 and Location Map

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-21 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED stated that the Bill is in order.

No one appeared in opposition.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 5 – Bill 2001-21

MINUTES - Continued:

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:17)

1-494

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-24 – Allows additional medical-related uses in the C-PB Zoning District.

Sponsored by: Councilman Larry Brown

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

Over the last few years, property in the C-PB (Planned Business Park) Zoning District has been approved for development with a variety of medical uses. The Zoning Code has not been updated to reflect that type of development in business parks. This bill will update the Zoning Code accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-24

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-24 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED stated that this Bill is a housekeeping item. Certain medical related uses have been allowed in the C-PB (Planned Business Park). The Zoning Code has not been updated to reflect that type of development in business parks. This Bill will bring the zoning tables into compliance so that medical related uses of all types would be allowed in the C-PB District.

No one appeared in opposition.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 6 – Bill 2001-24

MINUTES - Continued:

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:18 – 4:19)

1-511

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-25 – Revises the setback requirements for patio covers. Proposed by: Bob Genzer, Acting Director of Planning and Development

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

This bill will revise the Zoning Code setback requirements as they pertain to patio covers. Currently, patio covers have the same setback as the main structure, with the ability to extend further into the setback with the consent of neighboring property owners. This bill will simplify and standardize the requirements, and reduce staff work, by establishing a 15-foot setback for patio covers in the U, R-A and R-E Zoning Districts, and a 5-foot setback in the remaining residential districts.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-25

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-25 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation, with a press release to be sent out regarding the process for patio covers - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED indicated that the proposed Bill simplifies the patio cover approval process, including the variance process, while maintaining the integrity of the code. The current code requires that patio covers have the same setbacks as the principal structure. The Bill will reduce the impacts on neighboring property owners as well as establish

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 7 – Bill 2001-25

MINUTES - Continued:

A uniform fifteen-foot setback for U, R-A, and R-E zoning districts, and a five-foot setback for the remaining districts.

ROBERT GENZER, Acting Director, Planning and Development, added that one of the main concerns has been that one of the standards in the current code is that in some cases a property owner must obtain the approval of the adjacent property owners in order to be able to build a patio cover. An approval was very difficult to obtain in cases where the adjacent property owner is a non-resident and lives out of state. That requirement will be eliminated under the proposed Bill.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY felt that the public should be fully informed about this issue in order to understand the process, because it has become a hot topic of discussion. He suggested that more discussion was needed on the specifics of this Bill. MR. GENZER reiterated that the Bill establishes a very specific standard for patio covers, with five feet from both the rear and side property lines in all residential zones other than U, R-A, and R-E, where it would be fifteen feet because those zoning designations involve much larger parcels.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY insisted that the public should be better informed, because many people do not understand the terminology of the planners.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:19 – 4:23)

1-539

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-26 – Establishes development standards for accessory structures in commercial and industrial zoning districts. Proposed by: Bob Genzer, Acting Director of Planning and Development

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The Zoning Code presently contains little in the way of development standards for accessory structures in commercial and industrial zoning districts. This bill will establish a list of such standards.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-26

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-26 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED explained that the subject Bill would expand on the existing code, which does not adequately address standards for accessory structures in commercial and industrial zoning districts, only in residential zones.

ROBERT GENZER, Acting Director, Planning and Development, interjected that the most prominent type of accessory structure in a commercial zone would be a carport or a car cover.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 8 – Bill 2001-26

MINUTES - Continued:

This Bill establishes the standard so that they do not encroach into required landscaped areas along property lines. It also prohibits car covers from being placed in the front yard area. There are situations where, because there were no standards, car covers were allowed in front yard areas, which is not aesthetically pleasing.

AL GALLEG0, citizen of Las Vegas, requested the City also address sea-land containers, which are portable metal structures, because he does not agree with the City's current standards regarding these structures. MR. GENZER indicated that sea-land structures are covered under the category of sheds, and there are specific requirements for where sheds can be placed on residential properties. MR. GALLEG0 countered that a shed is a permanent structure that cannot be moved, unlike a sea-land container. He added that he was issued a citation for having a sea-land container and, therefore, does not know what he is going to do with the items that are stored in that structure. MR. GENZER offered to meet with MR. GALLEG0 to determine under which code section his citation was issued and to try to resolve the matter.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:23 – 4:28)

1-675

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

DEPARTMENT: CITY ATTORNEY

DIRECTOR: BRADFORD R. JERBIC

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NEW BILL:

Bill No. 2001-27 – Amends the Zoning Code to provide for the expiration of Site Development Plans. Sponsored by: Councilman Michael Mack

Fiscal Impact

☒

No Impact

Amount:

☐

Budget Funds Available

Dept./Division:

☐

Augmentation Required

Funding Source:

PURPOSE/BACKGROUND:

The Zoning Code currently does not address the duration of an approved Site Development Plan. In cases where development is delayed, conditions may change and a Site Development Plan may no longer be appropriate—at least without further review. This bill will establish a default two-year limit on Site Development Plans, subject to extension where applied for and approved.

RECOMMENDATION:

This bill should be submitted to a Recommending Committee for review, hearing and recommendation to the City Council for final action.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

Bill No. 2001-27

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

COUNCILMAN MACK recommended Bill No. 2001-27 be forwarded to the Full Council with a “Do Pass” recommendation - COUNCILMAN WEEKLY concurred.

MINUTES:

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing open.

CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY VAL STEED stated that the subject Bill establishes an expiration period of two years for site development plans, because many are approved and not exercised. The Council will still have the discretion to extend that period at the time of approval, or the applicant can request an extension.

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 2001
Item 9 – Bill 2001-27

MINUTES - Continued:

COUNCILMAN MACK noted that a condition addressing this issue is routinely being added. Adoption of this Bill makes it a standard condition. Eliminating the one-year reviews will also save time at the Council meetings.

COUNCILMAN MACK pointed out to MR. GENZER that he called the Planning Department regarding the notice signs, and still nothing has been done about it. There are a lot along Rancho Road. MR. GENZER indicated that he did respond, but he can advise the staff that go out into the field, which is every Thursday, to pull any old signs that were placed by applicants.

AL GALLEG0, citizen of Las Vegas, asked what would be done about signs that are placed behind fences. MR. GENZER indicated that the property owner would have to be contacted and required to remove the sign.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COUNCILMAN WEEKLY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(4:28 – 4:31)

1-860

RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
RECOMMENDING COMMITTEE MEETING OF: MARCH 5, 2001

ITEMS RAISED UNDER THIS PORTION OF THE AGENDA CANNOT BE DELIBERATED OR ACTED UPON UNTIL THE NOTICE PROVISIONS OF THE OPEN MEETING LAW HAVE BEEN MET. IF YOU WISH TO SPEAK ON A MATTER NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA, PLEASE CLEARLY STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS. IN CONSIDERATION OF OTHERS, AVOID REPETITION, AND LIMIT YOUR COMMENTS TO NO MORE THAN THREE (3) MINUTES. TO ENSURE ALL PERSONS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK, EACH SUBJECT MATTER WILL BE LIMITED TO TEN (10) MINUTES.

MINUTES:

None.

(4:31)
1-958

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:31 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:_____

ANGELA CROLLI
March 15, 2001